## Northern District of California

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WADE DERBY,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF PITTSBURG CALIFORNIA.

Defendant.

Case No. 16-cv-05469-SI

ORDER SETTING NEW BRIEFING SCHEDULE AND HEARING ON DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; MODIFYING **TRIAL DATES REGARDING** EXPERT DISCOVERY AND SETTLEMENT

Re: Dkt. No. 64

Plaintiff has filed a motion requesting an extension of time to file the opposition to defendant's motion for summary judgment. Plaintiff's opposition is due May 4, 2018, and plaintiff requests a 90 day extension of the deadline because one of his lawyers is currently engaged in a criminal trial, and plaintiff's other lawyer is "not a federal court motion writing wizard." Horowitz Decl. ¶ 3. Defendant opposes the request for an extension on numerous grounds, including that an extension would impact the current schedule for expert discovery and settlement discussions.

The Court will grant plaintiff an extension of time, though the Court finds that plaintiff has not demonstrated good cause for a 90 day extension. The Court sets the following schedule on defendant's motion for summary judgment: plaintiff's opposition must be filed by **June 8, 2018**, and defendant's reply is due **June 22, 2018**. The Court will hold a hearing on defendant's motion on July 6, 2018 at 10 a.m.

In order to accommodate the new summary judgment schedule, the Court sets the following new schedule for expert discovery: designation of experts shall be done by July 27,

## United States District Court Northern District of California